

SECTION M
EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

TABLE OF CONTENTS

M.1 INTRODUCTION/EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS 1

M.2 BASIS FOR AWARD 2

M.3 OVERALL RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF EVALUATION FACTORS 3

M.4 TECHNICAL EVALUATION FACTORS 4

M.5 FAR 52.217-5 EVALUATION OF OPTIONS (JUL 1990)..... 7

M.1 INTRODUCTION/EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS

This acquisition will be conducted pursuant to the policies and procedures in FAR Part 15, and DEAR Part 915. DOE has established a Source Evaluation Board (SEB) to evaluate the proposals submitted for this acquisition. Proposals will be evaluated by the SEB members in accordance with the procedures contained in FAR Part 15, DEAR Part 915, and the Evaluation Factors hereinafter described. The Source Selection Official (SSO) will select an Offeror for contract award using the best value analysis described in this section.

The instructions set forth in Section L, Instructions, Conditions, and Notices to Offerors, are designed to provide guidance to the Offeror concerning the documentation that must be provided in the Offeror's proposal. The Offeror must furnish adequate and specific information in its proposal response. cursory proposal responses that merely repeat or reformulate the Performance Work Statement are not acceptable. Further, a proposal will be eliminated from further consideration before the evaluation if the proposal is so grossly and obviously deficient as to be totally unacceptable on its face value. For example, a proposal will be deemed unacceptable if it does not represent a reasonable effort to address itself to the essential requirements of the Request for Proposal (RFP), or if it clearly demonstrates the Offeror does not understand the requirements of the RFP. A proposal will also be eliminated from further consideration before the evaluation if the Offeror is not able to certify that they do not exceed the small business size standard of \$32.5M under NAICS code 518210, *Data Processing, Hosting, and Related Services*, at the time proposals are due. In the event a proposal is rejected, a notice will be sent to the Offeror stating the reason(s) that the proposal will not be considered for further evaluation under this solicitation.

The Government intends to evaluate proposals and award one contract without discussions or exchanges with Offerors (except clarifications as described in FAR 15.306(a)). If a competitive range is established pursuant to FAR 15.306(c), Offerors are hereby advised that only the most highly rated proposals deemed to have a reasonable chance for award of a contract may be included in the competitive range. Offerors that are not included in the competitive range will be promptly notified. Therefore, the Offeror's proposal shall contain the Offeror's best terms from a price and technical standpoint. The Government reserves the right to conduct discussions if the Contracting Officer (CO) later determines them to be necessary.

Prior to award, a determination will be made regarding whether any possible Organizational Conflicts of Interest (OCI) exist with respect to the apparent successful Offeror or whether there is little or no likelihood that such conflict exists. In making this determination, the CO will consider the representation required by Section K of this RFP. An award will be made if there is no OCI or if any potential OCI can be appropriately avoided or mitigated.

Failure of Offerors to respond or follow the instructions regarding the organization and content of any of the proposal volumes may result in the Offeror's entire proposal,

consisting of volumes I through III, being eliminated from the initial evaluation; if such an offer becomes eliminated from initial evaluation, revisions to any of the proposal volumes will not be considered for evaluation.

Any exceptions or deviations to the terms and conditions of the RFP may make the offer unacceptable for award without discussions. If an Offeror proposes exceptions to the terms and conditions of the RFP, the Government may make an award without discussions to another Offeror that did not take exception to the terms and conditions of the RFP.

M.2 BASIS FOR AWARD

- (a) The Government reserves the right to eliminate from consideration for award any or all offers at any time prior to award of the Contract; to negotiate with offerors in the competitive range; and to award the Contract to the Offeror submitting the proposal determined to represent the best value – the proposal most advantageous to the Government, price and other factors considered.
- (b) The tradeoff process is selected as appropriate for this acquisition. The Government considers it to be in its best interest to allow consideration of award to other than the lowest priced Offeror or other than the highest technically rated Offeror.
- (c) In determining the best value to the Government, the Technical Evaluation Factors, when combined, are equal to the evaluated price. Evaluated price is the Offeror's "Total Proposed Price" as defined in Section M.4 below. The closer or more similar in merit the Offerors' technical proposals and relevant past performance information are evaluated to be, the more likely the evaluated price may be the determining factor in selection for award. However, the Government may select for award the Offeror whose price is not necessarily the lowest, but whose technical proposal is more advantageous to the Government and warrants the additional cost.

Selection of the best value to the Government will be achieved through the following:

- (1) The Government will assign adjectival ratings for each of the Technical Evaluation Factors specified in Section M.4, *Technical Evaluation Factors*, in accordance with Table M-1 and Table M-2. The assigned adjectival rating for Factor 1 will be based on the favorability of each Offeror's relevant past performance information. The assigned adjectival ratings for Factors 2, 3 and 4 will be based on any evaluated significant strengths, strengths, significant weaknesses, weaknesses and deficiencies identified in each Offeror's proposal for Factors 2, 3 and 4.
- (2) The Government will not make an award at an evaluated total proposed price premium it considers disproportionate to the benefits associated with the evaluated superiority of one Offeror's technical proposal and relevant past performance information over another.

- (3) The Government will assess whether the strengths and weaknesses and relevant past performance information between or among competing technical proposals indicates a superiority from the standpoint of: (1) what the difference might mean in terms of anticipated performance; and (2) what the evaluated price to the Government would be to take advantage of the difference.

M.3 OVERALL RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF EVALUATION FACTORS

The proposals will be adjectivally rated on the four technical evaluation factors below. All evaluation factors other than price, when combined, are equal in importance to price.

(a) Technical Evaluation Factors:

- Factor 1 - Relevant Past Performance
- Factor 2 - Technical and Management Approach
- Factor 3 - Relevant Experience
- Factor 4 - Key Personnel

The factors (factors 1, 2, 3 and 4) are in descending order of importance. Factor 1 is slightly more important than Factor 2 and Factor 3. Factor 2 and Factor 3 are equal in importance. Factor 2 and Factor 3 are each slightly more important than Factor 4.

Areas within an evaluation factor are not sub-factors and will not be individually rated, but will be considered in the overall evaluation for that particular evaluation factor.

The adjectival ratings to be assigned for each of the Technical Evaluation Factors are shown in Tables M-1 and M-2 below:

Table M-1: Adjectival Ratings Factor 1

Substantial Confidence
High Level Confidence
Satisfactory Confidence
Limited Confidence
No Confidence
Unknown Confidence (Neutral)

Table M-2: Adjectival Ratings Factors 2, 3 and 4

Outstanding

Good
Satisfactory
Marginal
Unsatisfactory

- (b) Price:
In determining best value to the Government, the Technical Evaluation Factors, when combined, will be considered equal in importance to Evaluated Price.

M.4 TECHNICAL EVALUATION FACTORS

Factor 1, Relevant Past Performance

- (a) For purposes of the past performance evaluation, DOE will evaluate the recent and relevant past performance of the Offeror, each entity comprising the teaming arrangement thereof, as defined in FAR 9.601(1), and major subcontractors for contracts or projects which are currently on-going or completed within the last three (3) years from the date of the solicitation, based on the similarity of the work in size, scope, and complexity to the functions of the PWS that each entity is proposed to perform.
- Size, scope and complexity are defined as follows:
1. **Size:** Dollar value and contract duration
 2. **Scope:** Type of work (e.g., work as identified in the PWS)
 3. **Complexity:** Performance challenges and risks (e.g. providing expert advice, assistance, and cost-effective solutions to respond rapidly to critical IT management issues with results based on current market and technical research, hands-on experience, and IT best practices; performing under a firm-fixed-price environment; and interfaces with DOE and other government Contractors).
- (b) The past performance will be evaluated on the basis of information furnished in the Attachment L-3, *Past Performance and Relevant Experience Reference Information Form*, and the information submitted by the Offeror's references on Attachment L-4, *Past Performance Questionnaires* (where applicable for non-DOE EM work or where a PPIRS record is not available). In addition, DOE may evaluate any other information obtained through the available Federal Government electronic databases, readily available Government records, and sources other than those identified by the Offeror.
- (c) During its evaluation, DOE may contact some or all of the references provided by the Offeror on Attachment L-3 and Attachment L-4, and those not identified by the Offeror, but listed in E-government databases, for information to be used in the past performance evaluation.
- (d) DOE will evaluate information provided on problems encountered on the

referenced contracts and the written discussion of corrective actions taken by the Offeror to resolve these problems. DOE will evaluate the information provided in Attachment L-5, *List of Contracts Terminated for Convenience or Default*, and the explanations provided for any terminations related to the Offeror, other teaming participants, and major subcontractors.

- (e) The higher the degree of relevance of the work described to the functions of the PWS an entity is proposed to perform, the greater the consideration that may be given. Additionally, more recent relevant past performance information may also be given greater consideration. It is the Offeror's responsibility to provide sufficient information to demonstrate the relevancy and similarity to the functions that each entity is proposed to perform of the information provided for the Past Performance evaluation in the Attachment L-3 forms. In evaluating relevancy, DOE may consider work performed on fixed-price contracts to be more relevant than work performed on other contract types.
- (f) DOE may obtain Past Performance information through all available sources, including Federal Government electronic databases (e.g., PPIRS), readily available Government records (including pertinent prime contracts), and sources other than those identified by the Offeror.
- (g) In the case of an Offeror without a record of relevant past performance, or for whom information on relevant past performance is not available, the Offeror will be evaluated neither favorably nor unfavorably.

Factor 2 – Technical and Management Approach

- (a) DOE will evaluate the Offeror's demonstrated understanding of and approach to accomplishing all elements of the PWS with a particular focus on the four major elements listed below, in accordance with all applicable statutes, regulations, and DOE Orders which pertain to the activities outlined in the PWS, and considering the anticipated funding profile.

Task 3, IT Mission Systems Support
Task 4, IT Cyber Security
Task 6, Records Management
Task 11, EM Cloud

DOE will evaluate the Offeror's technical assumptions used to determine its technical approaches to accomplishing all elements of the PWS, including the resources used, with a particular focus on the four major elements listed above.

- (b) DOE will evaluate the demonstrated ability of the Offeror's Staffing Plan to obtain, retain, and maintain the breadth and depth of qualified staff necessary to accomplish the work in a safe and efficient manner over the entire contract period. DOE will evaluate any ramp-up or ramp-down of employment and the

associated impacts to productivity during transition and throughout the contract period. DOE will evaluate the extent to which the Offeror's Staffing Plan reflects the skill mix and labor hours necessary to perform each element of the PWS by CLIN. DOE will evaluate the Offeror's rationale for the allocation of Full-time Equivalents (FTEs) by organizational element, as separated by (1) management and supervision, including the Key Personnel, (2) labor disciplines by skill mix, (3) CLIN, and (4) prime Offeror, teaming partner or subcontractor.

- (c) DOE will evaluate the Offeror's three most significant identified risks to successful contract performance of the PWS; the Offeror's rationale for the identified risks and their potential impacts; and the Offeror's approach to eliminating, avoiding, or mitigating the three most significant risks. If the Offeror identifies more than three risks, DOE will evaluate only the first three risks identified by the Offeror.

Factor 3 – Relevant Experience

DOE will evaluate the relevant experience of the Offeror, each entity comprising the teaming arrangement thereof, as defined in FAR 9.601(1), and each major subcontractor in performing work similar in size, scope, and complexity to the functions each entity is proposed to perform. DOE will evaluate the relevant experience of the Offeror, including any entity comprising the teaming arrangement thereof, as defined by FAR 9.601(1), and the Offeror's major subcontractor(s) for the same contracts or projects referenced for past performance information on Attachment L-3, *Past Performance and Relevant Experience Reference Information Form*. DOE will evaluate any improvements implemented in the performance of the work.

Factor 4 - Key Personnel

- (a) DOE will evaluate the proposed Key Personnel relative to how they will contribute to the Offeror's effectiveness and capability to perform the PWS.

DOE will evaluate the suitability of the proposed Key Personnel based on their demonstrated qualifications, education, leadership and experience performing work similar to their proposed positions.

In evaluating the Key Personnel, the Senior Program Manager will be considered more important than the Senior Technical Project Manager and the Senior Cyber Security Analyst.

Offerors are advised that DOE may contact any or all references to verify the accuracy of resume information.

Failure to submit a Letter of Commitment from each of the three key personnel and to provide resumes in the format specified in Attachment L-1

may result in a lower evaluation rating for this factor or the Offeror's proposal being eliminated from further consideration for award. Failure to propose a Senior Program Manager, Senior Technical Project Manager, and a Senior Cyber Security Analyst, will result in the Offeror's proposal being eliminated from further consideration for award.

Price Evaluation

The Offeror's price proposal will not be point scored or adjectivally rated, but will be evaluated to assess reasonableness and completeness. The Government will evaluate price based on the total proposed price, including the base period and the option periods, included in Section B.3 Contract Pricing. The total evaluated price will equal the sum of the prices proposed for the Firm-Fixed-Price CLINs and the DOE Provided Costs for the cost reimbursement CLINs (for the base period and the option periods).

DOE will evaluate the Offeror's demonstration of compliance with the Limitations on Subcontracting, as well as, the Offeror's documentation provided to ensure an adequate accounting system and adequate financial capability to complete the contract. Any proposal that does not meet the requirement in FAR 52.219-14 that at least 50% of the cost of contract performance incurred for personnel be expended for employees of the Offeror may be considered unacceptable and may not be considered for award

Proposal information contained in Volume III-Price Proposal may be considered as part of the evaluation of Volume II-Technical Proposal as it relates to evaluation Factors 1-Relevant Past Performance and Factor 3 Relevant Experience.

The government may use any or all of the price analysis techniques and procedures described in FAR 15.404-1(b) to determine price reasonableness. An unreasonable or incomplete Price Proposal may not be eligible for award.

M.5 FAR 52.217-5 EVALUATION OF OPTIONS (JUL 1990)

Except when it is determined in accordance with FAR 17.206(b) not to be in the Government's best interests, the Government will evaluate offers for award purposes by adding the total price for the option(s) to the total price for the basic requirement. Evaluation of the option(s) will not obligate the Government to exercise the option(s).